

## **Tiered Licensure TAC Meeting**

### **December 13, 2013**

Attending: Becky Meyer (via video conferencing), Lisa Burtenshaw (via video conferencing), Mikki Nuckols (via video conferencing), Paula Kellerer, Penni Cyr, Rod Gramer, Shawn Tiegs (via conference call), Tracie Bent, Senator Roy Lacey, and Representative Steven Harris

Dr. Roger Quarles welcomed the group and turned the time over to Christina Linder to give a summary of the research on tiered licensure. Ms. Linder referenced an article in the November 2012 issue of Kappan Magazine titled “The right start: Creating a strong foundation for the teaching career” by Linda Darling-Hammond. She believes it answers the question the committee asked during the last meeting, “What evidence do we have that tiered licensure is increasing student achievement?” The answer is: tiered licensure in and of itself doesn’t improve student achievement; it improves the ability to identify teachers that are going to be able to impact student learning, share their focus, and bring accountability. It’s a long-term focus; we can’t expect to see student achievement correlate automatically.

The article outlines three key tiers to creating a system for effective teaching: entry into the profession/assessment for initial licensing, assessment for professional licensing/induction period, and assessment of advanced certification. If a state is going to be successful in creating sustained change there have to be a few things in place. The first is common statewide standards that are related to meaningful student learning and shared across the profession. With the advent of the Idaho Core for student learning and the recent adoption of the new Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards for preparing teachers, we have a single system for looking at what we need to have students know and be able to do and what teachers must be able to know and do.

The second is performance based assessments based on the standards that are guiding state functions, such as teacher preparation, licensure, and advanced certification. We now have the Danielson Framework, and we’re looking at where a teacher falls in those different levels. We’re looking at teacher performance in the classroom based on what kind of work students are producing.

The third is local evaluation systems aligned to the same standards. By putting in place the framework for every teacher to be evaluated on the Danielson Framework for Teaching, we now have local evaluation systems aligned to the same standards.

The two things that haven’t been done yet are:

- Support structures to ensure trained evaluators, mentoring for teachers who need additional assistance, and fair decisions about personnel actions. Reliable evaluators are the lynch pin in the system.
- Aligned professional learning opportunities that support the improvement of teachers and teaching quality.

Dr. Quarles then transitioned the group to discuss the responses committee members sent after the last meeting to their rationales for tiered licensure. He asked Rod Gramer to begin by highlighting his key thoughts about tiered licensure.

Mr. Gramer drafted a three tiered licensure structure for teachers and administrators. The rationale for tiered licensure should be driving student outcomes. Mr. Gramer realizes there's not a direct connection between licensing or the career ladder and student outcomes, but he believes tiered licensure can drive teacher performance, which ultimately affects student performance. Tiered licensing should be tied to teacher performance and compensation should be based on performance. It should not be based on whether you have an advanced degree or how long you've taught. By the time someone becomes a master teacher, they should be compensated at the same level as an administrator, in order to encourage our best teachers to stay in the classroom.

Mr. Gramer then asked whether the group was confusing tiered licensure and career ladder. Is a license a property right? If so, don't you only need one license to teach, but there could be multiple tiers to a career ladder? Ms. Linder responded that North Carolina doesn't award the property right until after the three year initial licensure phase.

Ms. Cyr asserted that there's a system in place for incompetent teachers to leave the profession. The question is whether the system is being used and whether evaluators can be completely subjective. An interim license, with an evaluation or assessment at some point, is a reasonable thing to talk about, but once a license has been earned it shouldn't be revoked for incompetency.

Paula Kellerer suggested tiered licensure not be high stakes, but rather based on multiple evidence-based measures. The goal would be to support teachers in developing professional practices. Administrators or peers evaluating should be able to demonstrate objectivity, if teacher compensation or recognition is related to evaluations.

Dr. Kellerer also expressed concern about moving forward with tiered licensure without addressing compensation. Without financial incentive, the increased rigor of tiered licensure would create a situation where teachers don't want to teach in Idaho.

Becky Myer agreed with Dr. Kellerer's comments about compensation. She also expressed concern that if compensation at upper teacher tiers is the same as an administrator, a consequence may be a drought of administrators. Mr. Gramer suggested a solution to this may be tiers for administrators, too.

Dr. Kellerer encouraged inclusion of a strong mentoring component, including administrators. Online mentoring may work for rural school districts.

Lisa Burtenshaw likes the idea of a novice tier that includes mentoring. Her biggest concern is in the professional license when you combine evaluations and licensure, which is a property right. She would also like to see the flexibility to increase a teacher contract longitudinally (i.e. summer work or longer contract days to work with assessment, student data, etc.).

Mikki Nuckols said some teachers want to take on more responsibility beyond teaching in the classroom. However, some teachers don't like to be asked to do extra jobs, but they're afraid if they say no their job could be in jeopardy. Tiered licensure may give them comfort.

Rep. Harris asked whether there was an idea how many teachers would be in each tier. Ms. Cyr commented that setting limits on how many people could move into a tier might disincentivize teachers to strive to improve their practice. Dr. Quarles said the question goes beyond the scope of the committee; however, it may be possible to predict the number of teachers in each tier for budgetary purposes. Mr. Gramer noted that the marketplace will likely dictate how many people enter and exit the profession.

Dr. Quarles told the group that there's a natural migration within the current system for teachers to become administrators or move to more urban areas in order to increase their income. A tiered licensure system may prevent migration due to financial concerns. A good administrator will recognize the need for a mix of master teachers to mentor new teachers.

Rep. Harris asked whether movement from tier two to tier three was required, or if a teacher could stay at tier two if they want to remain in the classroom and not take on additional responsibilities. Mr. Gramer responded that's what appeals to him about a three tier system. The entry tier has a base level of pay. Within that first tier, there are still some raises. When a teacher moves to the second tier, they get an increase in pay and raises over the next three years. If a teacher moves to the third level, their salary goes up again significantly to a new base pay level. Teachers could stay at the second or third tier as long as they want with incremental increases, but they'll eventually max out until they move to a higher tier.

Ms. Cyr commented that state funding goes to an appropriation schedule, not the teacher's salary. The teacher's salary is negotiable at the local level.

Rep. Harris asked whether the passage of time and education advancement would continue to be primary criteria, and whether we should disallow leap frogging of superior teachers (i.e. third year teachers to advance to the professional tier over fourth year teachers in the initial tier).

Ms. Linder said other states have cautioned putting artificial limits, such as time, in place. She suggested rather that limits be put in place based on performance or achievement. Some programs may be able to prepare teachers to accomplish professional licensure within 1-2 years, other programs may need 3-5 years.

Ms. Burtenshaw asked what role mentors would play in large school districts during low hiring years when there aren't a lot of new teachers to mentor.

Ms. Cyr remarked she feels that once a license is earned, it should belong to that person. Tiered licensure should be about improving the practice, profession, and student performance. She believes most teachers feel the same, but haven't had a vehicle to do so, other than becoming an administrator or migrating. Tiered licensure can be about mentoring pre-service teachers, mentoring struggling

teachers, working in professional learning communities, etc. Mentoring should not stop at the novice level. It needs to happen throughout an educator's career. If a professional educator is respected, paid well, and given the ability to advance at their level, they'll likely stay in the profession. If not, they'll likely go somewhere else.

Sen. Lacey said he likes the concept of a career ladder. His biggest concern is how you integrate and mesh the career ladder with the current salary system. You can't have winners and losers coming into the system. You can't push to make this happen this budget cycle. It needs to be ready to go and fully defined. Sen. Lacey doesn't think any state the committee has talked to yet has the right evaluation of the system to pattern after.

Dr. Quarles reminded the group they're the Tiered Licensure Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), not the Career Ladder TAC. You could have tiered licensure without the career ladder (funding) tied to it. The Network for Transforming Educator Preparation (NTEP) grant spans over two years. That may be enough time, or it may not be. We've been having discussions about tiered licensure in the state for years. We know there's more work to do, like the career ladder, but he encouraged the group to have the conversation simultaneously while focusing on the tiered licensure aspect.

Rep. Harris recommended the committee get a refresher on tiered licensure and how it couples with the career ladder.

Ms. Linder commented that she thinks there's agreement in the TAC that some initial/novice period of licensure is needed, and that there should be specific performance assessments and evidences before honoring someone with a professional license. Once a professional license is achieved, an educator has property rights to that license. You could then implement a career ladder with additional levels of expertise or areas of endorsement for teachers to set themselves up as an expert, if they choose. The additional level should be called out specifically, rather than randomly assigned, so compensation increases incentivization. Pay and licensure are different, but they fit well together because they both help recruit and retain teachers. It's possible to do multiple levels of licensure with multiple bands of career ladder on top of each level.

Mr. Gramer remarked that a licensure system will only drive student outcomes if a career ladder is in place. You need both tiered licensure and a career ladder to be effective.

Sen. Lacey asked if a natural-born teacher came into the system, could they skip ahead in licensure or get a bump in pay? Ms. Linder said that's something for the committee to discuss. Funding for a career ladder won't come until lawmakers are sure there's a system in place that will make a difference. The committee can't wait to set up a system, or the funding won't come. Sen. Lacey believes the money is in the budget, and if it's going to happen it will happen this year. He also wants to make sure we're ready. Ms. Cyr followed up by saying she'd like to make sure it can be funded ongoing.

Ms. Bent said a tiered licensure system lets the people doing the hiring know what knowledge, skills and abilities a teacher has based on the level they're at. It would be great to have a career ladder in place, but she doesn't think that it has to be done initially. It will bear out on its own at the local level, because

districts will trust the system and hire teachers and pay them based on their licensing. Having a tiered system where people can move into different levels has been proven to show that the individuals in those careers tend to go forward for advancement, because they want to be recognized for their skills. When your system is flat, whether you're a good teacher or a bad teacher doesn't matter. There is no incentive in a flat system.

Ms. Bent doesn't believe there should be time constraints in an individual tier. However, at the novice level, if an educator hasn't shown proficiency at the end of three years, it's time to go back and reflect on whether that person belongs in the profession. A time limit for the novice tier and the renewal periods are important.

Ms. Bent also looks at each tier as separate licenses. If the committee ends up deciding on continuing education unit (CEU) credits as a measure for renewal, Ms. Bent hopes the committee will put specific requirements on those CEUs so they're more applicable and meaningful.

Dr. Quarles was the last committee member to share his thoughts on the rationale for a tiered licensure system. The two reasons Dr. Quarles gave for moving forward were the need for initial licensure to be more rigorous and highly-effective teachers to be recognized as professionals, compensated accordingly, and accountable for maintaining their expertise. He believes there needs to be a way for educators with the drive to advance through a system currently stymied by a system of years of service and number of credits, which doesn't translate into performance.

Rep. Harris asked whether it was within the scope of the committee to discuss administrator licensure. Dr. Quarles said it was and asked Dr. Kellerer if institutions of higher education have had administrator licensure conversations. Dr. Kellerer responded that there have been varying levels of conversations, but administrator licensure conversations haven't been as advanced as teacher licensure conversations. Northwest Nazarene University has started pilots in the Charlotte Danielson framework to determine reliability of evaluating for the current candidates for administration.

Mr. Gramer asked how more than two tiers of tiered licensure can dovetail with a career ladder. Ms. Linder responded that there are a number of models to mesh the two. She reminded the group of Jason Hancock's presentation to the committee in October and his model to phase teachers into a career ladder. Ms. Cyr followed up by saying she envisions the mastery level as a place where classroom teachers can be in the classroom part-time and do mastery-level skills identified by their local districts.

Lisa Burtenshaw asked whether compensation for hard-to-fill positions could be included in a career ladder. Dr. Quarles said Superintendent Luna has put forward a budget that includes a career ladder. It remains to be seen whether the Governor's recommendation will include funding for the career ladder and whether the Joint Finance-Appropriations Committee (JFAC) and the Legislature will agree. Rep. Harris commented that the committee's focus is on licensure, regardless of compensation issues. Dr. Quarles pointed out that it may be easier for JFAC to allocate compensation resources if they have a tiered licensure model first. Rep. Harris followed up by saying it may be difficult to determine the worth of a professional or master teacher license until they're defined.

The committee then took a 15 minute break.

### *Washington*

After the break, Ms. Linder introduced Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director of the Washington Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB). The PESB in Washington is the state regulatory board that governs teacher education preparation, certification, continuing education, and assignment policies for all certified educators. Beginning educator mentoring is the responsibility of the Office of Public Instruction.

Regarding teacher preparation standards, the state started out with standards that were very topical and required certain courses and credits. From there the state moved to performance-based standards that described teacher behaviors and associated signature assessment through programs that defined the standards. Most recently the state has moved to evidence-based standards, which added to the performance-based standards, and described student learning behaviors that result from good teaching.

Like most states, Washington has struggled with over-reliance on professional judgment and inputs, in lieu of available outcome-based measures. Teacher preparation program review and approval every five to seven years is no longer sufficient. The state is working to move toward ongoing, transparent data and evidence. Teacher preparation programs now have annual program deliverables. The goal is to have data related evidence for all program standards that can be reviewed on an ongoing basis. The annual report impacts the scope of the on-site reviews every five to seven years. This also allows the PESB to provide more individualized assistance to the institution, based on their data.

Washington is a lead state for the pre-service performance assessment, ed Teacher Performance Appraisal (edTPA). The edTPA will be a program completion requirement, not a certification requirement, for all candidates beginning in January 2014. Washington had a home-grown assessment previously, but realized it was never going to have the necessary validity and reliability for program improvement.

EdTPA set a national cut score of 42. However, Washington decided to set their cut score much lower at 35. The Board felt that since it was a new instrument, they would set it low and review it every year with the potential of raising it over time.

Dr. Quarles asked whether they had administered their edTPA yet. Ms. Wallace said there's been a full participation field trial for the past two years. There was also a small-scale field trial prior to that. The assessment was being developed as they were field testing. That long of a field test period may not make sense for other states now, but it was a good opportunity to work out problems without consequence.

Dr. Kellerer asked what annual deliverables are required from institutions of higher education and whether they're made public. Ms. Wallace said annual data manuals have a central focus and are mapped to the standards. Every year, the PESB works with a team of data stewards at each teacher preparation program and work to define and put together the data deliverables. Every year when the

manual comes before the Board, the program speaks to it, and they often have elements they add for their own improvement. The programs aren't used to seeing data that compares them to each other, but it gives interesting insight on what's going on in the institution.

Dr. Kellerer also asked if Washington had implemented all of the edTPA rubrics in all of the areas and who their evaluators are. Washington uses Pearson's pool of scorers, which includes Washington faculty. Programs also do some of the scoring internally. All the training is provided by Pearson, and the scorers are paid through Pearson. It's all funded through candidate cost. The edTPA costs about \$300, and it covers the costs around training and scoring.

Ms. Wallace went on to outline the requirements for a first-issue teaching certificate in Washington: a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution, completion of a state-approved preparation program, the Basic Skills Test, and a Subject Knowledge/Endorsement test. The general requirements for a first-issue administrator certificate are a master's degree, certified P-12 teaching experience, completion of a state-approved preparation program, and a teaching certificate with three years school-based instructional experience.

Candidates exit the preparation program with a draft professional growth plan. It outlines the areas where the candidate is strong and where they need to focus professional growth. Districts find the information useful in formulating their beginning teacher induction and mentoring programs.

Years 1-2 are induction and mentoring periods. It's expected that by year 3 teachers will have achieved the professional certificate. The professional certificate is earned via the ProTeach Portfolio, an online performance assessment. It consists of three major entries that serve as evidence of student and teacher work. Teachers have a 14 month window to create the portfolio.

One interesting early result is that less experienced teachers outperform more experienced teachers on the ProTeach Portfolio. In January 2014, the results of study that is looking at whether ProTeach identifies teachers with better student learning gains will be released.

Dr. Quarles asked who develops the professional growth plans that the candidate comes into the initial licensure with. Ms. Wallace responded that the plans are imbedded in the preparation program. The district then works with the teacher to tailor their mentoring. The template for the growth plan is geared toward attaining the professional tier. For teachers and administrators, certificate renewal also requires professional growth planning.

Dr. Quarles then asked in the peer review of the professional growth plans whether there was compensation for the review or whether it counted towards the reviewer's certificate renewal. Ms. Wallace responded that there's not currently an experience requirement in the peer review, and it doesn't currently count toward a reviewer's certificate renewal.

Dr. Quarles then asked who scores the ProTeach portfolios. Ms. Wallace said trained educators, including Washington educators, conduct the scoring online. EdTPS is responsible for the training and administration. Candidates register through EdTPS. It's a \$495 performance assessment.

Ms. Wallace continued by talking about the timeline of the tiered licensure system. Previously, the first tier in Washington was up to 12 years. The consensus was that this was too drawn out, and an appropriate post induction time frame was years 3-5. A committee came to agreement on a fair timeline for teachers to be expected to move from the first-issue tier to the second-issue tier that takes into account breaks in service. If the ProTeach portfolio isn't completed, the teacher loses their license. Seven teachers last year didn't complete a ProTeach portfolio and can no longer teach.

Washington hasn't created a master or mentor teacher credential, because of distribution concerns. Without adequacy funding, districts most in need of master teachers would be least likely to get them.

Administrators also have a two-tier licensure system. They exit preparation programs with a professional growth plan and go through two years of induction and mentoring. In years 3-5 they must earn a professional certificate, which is run through higher education preparation programs.

Licensure renewal requires 150 hours or 15 credits aligned with knowledge and skill standards every 5 years. Starting next year, professional growth planning will also be required.

Ms. Linder asked if there was any way a teacher could lose their licensure and what the incentive was to do well on the professional growth plan. Ms. Wallace said completion of a professional growth plan is required for certificate renewal. The peer review process is used to ensure quality of the professional growth plan.

Mr. Gramer asked if certificate renewal was based at all on student achievement and if compensation was tied to licensure. Ms. Wallace said Washington has kept a firewall between decisions related to certification and decisions related to employment. In terms of compensation, there's a statewide allocation model that most districts adopt as their salary schedule. There's a lot of desire for change, but changing it would be exceedingly costly. The salary schedule is based on years of experience and accumulating credits, which is not in line with the tiered licensure.

Dr. Quarles asked what Washington's rationale was for moving to a tiered licensure system. Ms. Wallace said there have been different tiered licensure models in Washington since the 1990s. It came out of the realization that there's only so much you can cram into a first tier licensure, but there are certain competencies necessary for teachers to require in service. Open professional development doesn't guarantee refreshment of those skills, and just having an entry level is insufficient.

Ms. Cyr asked whether the state has considered adding a third tier. Ms. Wallace said a report was done for the legislature, which asked whether the third tier should be an attainment of more accomplished skills or a specific role. If it was attainment of more accomplished skills, the state already recognized this through National Board Certification awards. If it was a third tier for a specific role, the report recommended funding that role.

Dr. Kellerer asked what student outcomes are being used to study whether the ProTeach portfolio is correlated to student outcomes? Ms. Wallace responded it's student assessment data from required state assessments in a value-added study.



Ms. Linder thanked Ms. Wallace for her time and preparation in presenting to the committee.

Ms. Linder then told the committee the EdTPA, the standardized performance assessment for initial certification being used in Washington, was piloted in Idaho. One point of concern was EdTPA is just for pre-service. There was no corollary for in-service, so there wasn't a continuum of learning. Idaho institutions of higher education decided to use the Danielson Framework instead, because there can be a consistent conversation between pre-service and in-service about growth.

The committee then took a break for lunch until 1:15 pm/MT.

### *New Mexico*

After lunch, the committee heard a presentation from Dr. Peter Winograd, Director of the Center for Education Policy Research at the University of New Mexico. New Mexico had a teacher shortage in the 1990s. Teacher salaries were very low and the state had trouble retaining new teachers. New Mexico wanted to attract the best people into the classroom and reward them.

New Mexico licensure has two major parts: an annual evaluation and a three-level licensure advancement program.

The state decided that if they put in more measures of accountability, they were willing to pay higher salaries. In 2007-2008, a Level 1 (Provisional) teacher made \$30,000, a Level 2 teacher made \$40,000, and a Level 3 made \$50,000.

One of the problems New Mexico ran into was their principal's evaluating teacher quality. To deal with this, the state developed dossiers that were blind reviewed by outside reviewers, in addition to the school administrators. A Level 1 teacher could remain in Level 1 for three years, and then they had to move up to Level 2 or move out of the profession. They could remain in Level 2 for as long as they wanted.

Since the roll out of tiered licensure in New Mexico, there is no longer a teacher shortage. New Mexico went from being ranked last in the country for teacher salary to around 30<sup>th</sup>. The conversation within the state is now about including value-added scores into the tiered system.

One of the unintended consequences of raising Level 3 teacher salaries to \$50,000 was that many teachers decided to stay in the classroom, rather than becoming administrators. The state was then forced to raise principal salaries, as well.

Mr. Gramer asked whether the three compensation levels were fixed, or whether teachers were eligible for performance raises. Dr. Winograd explained those were the minimum salaries for that level.

Ms. Cyr asked whether there had been a push recently to move away from tiered licensure in the state. First, Dr. Winograd said when the recession hit in 2009 the state legislature had to cut the education budget. They couldn't cut teacher salaries, because the salaries were in law, but that made up the majority of the education budget. There were some legislators upset over this.

Second, many people said the best way to increase student achievement was to get the best teachers into the classroom. Math scores and high school graduation rates went up, but reading scores stayed the same. Some people then said tiered licensure didn't work, because student achievement across the board didn't go up.

Third, there's a push in New Mexico to move to value-added. Half a teacher's evaluation is currently based on student growth. It's a very contentious issue.

Dr. Quarles asked how teachers advance from one tier to another, specifically the difference between a Tier 1 teacher and a Tier 3 teacher, other than experience. Dr. Winograd responded that in the dossier, there are nine competencies. There is a different rubric for each of those competencies, depending on the level. To advance a level, you have to prove you can meet the competencies at the level you are applying for.

Dr. Quarles asked what evidence is used to determine whether they've met the competencies in a rubric.

Dr. Kellerer asked how a teacher begins Level 1. Dr. Winograd answered that a candidate can go through a regular teacher preparation program through a university or through an alternative license program, if you already have a degree. Competencies in pre-service don't necessarily align from pre-service to evaluations in the first year, though.

Mr. Gramer asked whether New Mexico is planning to add student growth as a metric for moving through licensure. Dr. Winograd said the dossier requires teachers to identify a few students, assess where they're at, and identify what instructional approach they'll use to help students advance. Student growth models weren't readily available when New Mexico's system was developed.

Ms. Linder asked whether New Mexico had looked at student learning objective models to incorporate student achievement. Dr. Winograd responded that whatever measure of student learning is put into place, it has to be fair across the state.

Dr. Quarles thanked Dr. Winograd for his time and assistance in sharing New Mexico's tiered licensure system.

Dr. Quarles said he has had some conversations with some of the folks in the state of New Mexico about the implementation of the system. They've invested \$400 million into tiered licensure in the past, but don't plan to continue funding it at the same level going forward. It solved the teacher recruitment and retention problems, and math and graduation rates improved, but reading scores remained flat.

Mr. Gramer noted that none of the states the committee has researched have data to show tiered licensure has helped student outcome. He believes the committee must build a student growth component into Idaho's tiered licensure system.

Rep. Harris pointed out that teacher retention likely came from the increased funds, not necessarily the licensing structure.

Ms. Linder noted that it's only been in the last five years that we've moved away from measuring teacher quality based on inputs to student outcomes based on instruction. Student learning objectives are the latest in the national conversation and something Ms. Linder urged the committee to look at, because it accounts for each child's student academic growth. Value-added models are extremely expensive, because you must pay for end of course assessments in each course area, or they're limited to the standardized tests already in place. That won't meet Idaho's needs. The lack of data around tiered licensure systems and student achievement isn't a reflection of the system; it's a reflection of the context we've been working in.

Rep. Harris said one of the primary benefits he saw was a way of filtering teachers in the early years.

Dr. Quarles commented that through a tiered licensure system the mentoring conversation can be reinvigorated.

The committee then took a short break.

After the break, Dr. Quarles asked the group to draft a rationale statement for tiered licensure in Idaho.

Ms. Bent began by suggesting we want teachers to be learner-ready when they go into the classroom and we want to retain quality teachers.

Ms. Cyr's rationale was to improve the teaching profession, make sure when professional licensure is granted the teacher is actually ready to teach, and to have a mentor program.

Sen. Lacey's rationale was tiered licensure allows for a probationary period for administrators to decide whether teachers are highly effective, since the process in place now is not always used to remove ineffective teachers.

Mr. Tiegs cautioned against student achievement as the rationale, since there are so many considerations to improving student achievement. He preferred a focus on teacher retention.

Ms. Myer's rationale was the mentoring program in the first three years.

Ms. Nuckols' rationale was teacher retention in the early years.

Ms. Burtenshaw's rationale was to raise the standards of the profession.

Rep. Harris commented that mentoring can be done without licensing changes, so it needs to be clear how it ties into licensing.

Dr. Quarles summarized the following rationale he heard from the group:

- Create learner ready teachers
- Retain new teachers
- Raise standards for the profession
- Mentoring

- Raise accountability for administrators in regards to new teachers
- Meaningful professional relationships in every building
- Improve instructional practices by new teachers

Rep. Harris asked to add the point that it helps filter out low performing teachers.

Ms. Cyr asked who determines whether someone gets a professional license. Ms. Linder responded that we know there will be multiple measures, and one of those key measures will be the Framework for Evaluation. The Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Study suggests that not only the administrator be responsible for doing evaluations, but also three different observers watching for 15 minutes each.

Ms. Cyr then asked where peer assistance falls. Dr. Kellerer clarified that peer assistance, when done well, is not unlike a system of mentoring and has a role in the first three years.

Dr. Quarles said staff would draft a theory of rationale around the comments the groups had given. He then transitioned the group to discussing what the multiple measures would look like to gain and maintain initial licensure. He suggested professional growth plans and peer assistance.

Ms. Bent asked Ms. Linder to review the measures from the MET Study that determined whether a teacher was effective. Ms. Linder said the MET Study found if a teacher performs at a 3 or better on the Framework for Teaching, then students will achieve. There were three measures to determine whether a teacher was basic or proficient: observation, student surveys, and standardized test scores.

Mr. Gramer asked Dr. Quarles whether professional growth plans would be a requirement for teachers in initial licensure and asked what it would contain. Dr. Quarles said these plans are happening in the teacher preparation programs and follows them into initial licensure.

Dr. Quarles then summarized the multiple measures for gaining and maintaining initial licensure he'd heard from the group:

- Peer assistance/mentoring
- Student performance/achievement
- Evaluation
- Student Survey
- Professional growth plan

Dr. Quarles then asked if there were any additional measures from the group.

Dr. Kellerer asked to add self-reflections.

Ms. Linder listed three areas she'd like to add: use of data, self-reflection, and instructional shifts to address the Idaho Core Standards.

Dr. Quarles then summarized a revised list of measures:

- Professional growth plan

- Student Survey
  - Self-reflection
  - Use of data
  - Instructional shifts to get to the Idaho Core
- Peer assistance/mentoring
- Student performance/achievement
- Evaluation

Ms. Cyr commented that she's concerned that districts implement the Framework for Teaching differently. She would like to see it standardized, if it's going to be used in licensure. She also expressed concern that the State Department of Education doesn't have the capacity to handle all the training required for peer assistance.

Mr. Tiegs commented that he still thinks filtering teachers out of the profession is best done at the teacher preparation level.

Ms. Burtenshaw asked whether there needs to be another initial license for teachers coming from out of state. Ms. Linder responded that's why there's a need for a single measure and a vetting period.

Dr. Quarles asked the group to allow staff to craft a rationale statement and a list of measures for gaining and maintaining initial licensure for the committee's review and consideration prior to meeting again. He also asked the committee members to solicit feedback from their respective organizations and constituencies.

Ms. Wells asked the committee to send her their available Friday afternoons in January for the purpose of scheduling the next meeting.

The committee adjourned at 3:29 pm.